

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/725,802	12/02/2003	Michael Joseph Washburn	139682UL (15276US01) 3317 EXAMINER	
23446	7590 11/27/2006			
	EWS HELD & MALI	CHOW, DOON Y		
500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3400		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO,		2629		
			DATE MAILED: 11/27/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/725,802	WASHBURN, MICHAEL JOSEPH	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dennis-Doon Chow	2629	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D. (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
<ol> <li>Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 S</li> <li>This action is FINAL.</li> <li>Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E</li> </ol>	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)  1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	· · (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate	

Application/Control Number: 10/725,802

Art Unit: 2629

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3, 5-8, and 11-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tynan (6213945) in view of Gaughan et al. (5589893).

Regarding to claims 1, 2, 7, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, Tynan discloses a medical diagnostic ultrasound imaging system comprising a trackball 120 for controlling the medical diagnostic ultrasound imaging system (col. 2, lines 29-47).

Tynan does not explicitly disclose the trackball remotely controls system.

Gaughan discloses a remote trackball device and a method for operating a display (imaging) system, comprises: moving a trackball in a handheld trackball (mousing) device (see Fig. 6); means for transmitting a command based on movement of the trackball to display (imaging) system from the handheld device, and adjusting a setting or function of the display (imaging) system based on the command (col. 4, line 40 to col. 5, line 11).

In light of Gaughan, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Gaughan's remote trackball in Tynan's system as a user interface 120 because the remote trackball allow the user to move free while controlling system.

Application/Control Number: 10/725,802

Art Unit: 2629

Regarding to claim 3, Gaughan further discloses the moving step comprises depressing (clicking) the trackball (col. 4, lines 28-34).

Regarding to claims 5, 11, 15, 16, 17, Gaughan further discloses the handheld device including a remote keypad (46, Fig. 2).

Regarding to claims 6, 8, Gaughan further discloses pressing a button on the handheld device to trigger a display (imaging) system command (col. 5, lines 5-8).

Regarding to claim 20, Gaughan does not explicitly disclose using a fastener in the handheld device to for attaching the device to the user. However, it is well known in the art to use a fastener such as a clipper to attach a handheld electronic device such as a cellular phone to a user. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a fastener in Gaughan's device to attach the device to the user so the handheld device can be reached when it is needed.

Regarding to claims 21-22, Gaughan further discloses the device is integrated with the keypad imaging instrument (46, see Fig. 2 and col. 3, lines 5-8).

3. Claims 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tynan in view of Gaughan et al. as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Chang (5298919).

The modified Tynan does not disclose having a wheel on the device.

Chang, in the same input field, discloses mounting a wheel (18, Fig. 1) on a handheld device for inputting additional movement to a display system.

In light of Chang, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Chang's wheel in the device of the modified Tynan so that additional movement can be inputted to the system of the modified Tynan.

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tynan in view of Gaughan et al. as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of applicant's admitted prior art.

The modified Tynan does not disclose the using of a voice command. However, it is well known in the art to use a voice to generating a command. Applicant's admitted prior art, for example, teaches this well known voice command (see page 3, [3]). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the well known voice command in the system of the modified Tynan so that a command signal can be generating with the use of the user's voice.

#### Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Application/Control Number: 10/725,802

Art Unit: 2629

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis-Doon Chow whose telephone number is 571-272-7767. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on 571-272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/725,802 Page 6

Art Unit: 2629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Dennis-Doon Chow Primary Examiner Art Unit 2629

D. Chow November 22, 2006